



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/683,972	03/07/2002	Klaus Kursawe	CH920000068US1	9293

48915 7590 01/10/2007

CANTOR COLBURN LLP-IBM YORKTOWN  
55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH  
BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002

EXAMINER

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2007

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief  
(37 CFR 41.37)**

Application No.

09/683,972

Applicant(s)

KURSAWE, KLAUS

Examiner

James Alpert

Art Unit

3693

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

The Appeal Brief filed on 19 October 2006 is defective for failure to comply with one or more provisions of 37 CFR 41.37.

To avoid dismissal of the appeal, applicant must file an amended brief or other appropriate correction (see MPEP 1205.03) within **ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS** from the mailing date of this Notification, whichever is longer.

**EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136.**

1. ☐ The brief does not contain the items required under 37 CFR 41.37(c), or the items are not under the proper heading or in the proper order.
2. ☐ The brief does not contain a statement of the status of all claims, (e.g., rejected, allowed, withdrawn, objected to, canceled), or does not identify the appealed claims (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(iii)).
3. ☐ At least one amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection, and the brief does not contain a statement of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(iv)).
4. ☐ (a) The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawings, if any, by reference characters; and/or (b) the brief fails to: (1) identify, for each independent claim involved in the appeal and for each dependent claim argued separately, every means plus function and step plus function under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, and/or (2) set forth the structure, material, or acts described in the specification as corresponding to each claimed function with reference to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawings, if any, by reference characters (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(v)).
5. ☒ The brief does not contain a concise statement of each ground of rejection presented for review (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vi)).
6. ☐ The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each ground of rejection on appeal (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vii)).
7. ☐ The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(viii)).
8. ☐ The brief does not contain copies of the evidence submitted under 37 CFR 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or of any other evidence entered by the examiner **and relied upon by appellant in the appeal**, along with a statement setting forth where in the record that evidence was entered by the examiner, as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(ix)).
9. ☐ The brief does not contain copies of the decisions rendered by a court or the Board in the proceeding identified in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of the brief as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(x)).
10. ☒ Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):

See Continuation Sheet.

Continuation of 10. Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):

The "Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal" must indicate that the rejections made by the examiner were made under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). An example statement is as follows:

Claims 1-2,4-7 and 9-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Joao et al, in view of Camacho et al, and in further view of Stoutenberg et al. The rejections of Claims 1-2,4-7 and 9-20 under 35 U.S.C 103(a), as being allegedly unpatentable over Joao et al, in view of Camacho et al, in further view of Stoutenberg et al, are herein appealed.

Another example statement is as follows:

Whether Claims 1-2,4-7, and 9-20 were properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joao et al, in view of Camacho et al, and in further view of Stoutenberg et al.

The examiner would favor the second version.

Although there was some confusion in a previous telephonice conversation, the Examiner did make mention of the need for "Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed" section of the brief to identify the issue by statute.

The examiner would respectfully request that this correction be made, and resubmitted. Failure to correct the brief could possibly result in dismissal of the appeal or abandonment of the case.